

Attorney Docket No. 40101/09501 (2004.005)

REMARKS**I. INTRODUCTION**

No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1-16 and 18-25 remain pending in this application. Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 12-15. It is respectfully submitted that based on the following remarks, all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-8, 11, 19, 20 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0018683 to Zhao et al. (hereinafter "Zhao") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,865,611 to Bragg (hereinafter "Bragg") in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0083944 to Liu et al. (hereinafter "Liu"). (See 06/04/08 Office Action, p. 2).

Claim 1 recites, "the compression information being included in the compressed Ipv6 address." The Examiner asserts that the above recitation of claim 1 is taught in Liu in paragraphs [0046]-[0053] and Figure 5. (See 06/04/08 Office Action, p. 6). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner is correct in stating that neither Zhao nor Bragg teach or suggest the above limitation of claim 1. However, the Examiner is incorrect in asserting that Liu teaches the above limitation of claim 1. Liu teaches that the compression information is included in a separate IPv6 address, in a separate packet stream. This IPv6 address is not the compressed IPv6 address that the decompressor is attempting to decompress. Liu states that, "The following describes in a way of examples how first addresses data carried in a packet stream may be compressed using second addresses data carried in another packet stream. (See Liu par. [0030]). Liu further states that, "an implementation may choose to have more flexibility, for example, to allow compression

Attorney Docket No. 40101/09501 (2004.005)

of cur_addr (i.e. either source or destination address in the current packet) by using either the source or destination address in the base context.” (See Liu par. [0036]). In either case, Liu requires a second address, in a separate packet, to provide the decompressor with the compression information for each IPv6 address. Liu is very specific in stating that a second IPv6 address is required, and as such cannot include the compression information in the currently compressed IPv6 packet.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Zhao, Bragg nor Liu, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest “the compression information being included in the compressed Ipv6 address,” as recited in claim 1. Because claims 2-5 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Independent claim 6 recites, “including the compression information in the compressed IPv6 address.” Applicant submits that this claim is also allowable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Independent claims 7, 19 and 24 recite, “the compression information being included in the compressed IPv6 address.” Applicant submits that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Because claims 8 and 11 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 7, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable. Because claims 20, 22 and 23 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 19, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable.

Claims 9, 10 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao in view of Bragg in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0193956 to Dietrich (hereinafter “Dietrich”). (See 06/04/08 Office Action, p. 10).

Applicant submits that Dietrich doesn’t cure the above-described deficiencies of Zhao, Bragg and Liu with respect to claims 7 and 19. Because claims 9 and 10 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 7, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are

Attorney Docket No. 40101/09501 (2004.005)

also allowable. Because claim 21 depends from, and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 19, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable.

Claims 16, 18 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao in view of Bragg and Liu in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0264465 to Dunk (hereinafter "Dunk"). (See 06/04/08 Office Action, p. 11).

Applicant submits that Dunk doesn't cure the above-described deficiencies of Zhao, Bragg and Liu with respect to claims 1 and 24. Applicant further submits that claim 16 is allowable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Because claim 18 depends from, and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 16, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable. Because claim 25 depends from, and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 24, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable.

Attorney Docket No. 40101/09501 (2004.005)

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 4, 2008By: 

Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-619-6000
Fax: 212-619-0276